

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, the applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Accordingly, it is believed that this application is in condition for allowance. **If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues, or believes that some or all of the claims are not in condition for allowance, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned to schedule a telephone Examiner Interview before any further actions on the merits.**

The applicants will now address each of the issues raised in the outstanding Office Action. Before doing so, however, the undersigned would like to thank Examiner Piziali for courtesies extended during a telephone interview on October 6, 2004 (referred to as "the telephone interview" below).

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-9 and 12-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by the applicant's prior art, and more specifically, Figure 7 of the present application. The applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this ground of rejection in view of the following.

Filed herewith is a diagram that is an extension of Figure 7, and that illustrates the Examiner's application of the claim language to the structure of Figure 7. Specifically, the during the telephone interview, the

Examiner clarified that in the example on pages 5 and 6 of Paper No. 21, there are 544 pixels, 17 pixels per group, and 16 connections, where  $N = 272$ . Note that this interpretation corresponds to the text at the bottom of page 7 of Paper No. 21, though not the simplified Figure on that page.

During the telephone interview, the undersigned noted that if the Examiner were to apply the claim language to Figure 7 in that way, he would violate the recitation that  $N$  is also "the minimum number corresponding to the periodic unit about connections from said gate electrodes to said connection terminals within said successive pixel rows." Specifically,  $N$  would be 16 in the case of Figure 7, and therefore the Examiner's interpretation with  $N$  being 272 violated an express claim recitation.

The Examiner indicated that the existing wording of this feature in each of independent claims 1-6 was confusing in his opinion. The amendments to each of independent claims 1-6 clarify this distinguishing feature of the invention. Specifically, these claims now recite that  $N$  is also the minimum periodic unit of connections from said gate electrodes to said connection terminals within said successive pixel rows. To reiterate, this feature, in combination with the other recited features of claims 1-6, are not disclosed by Figure 7. Accordingly, each of these independent claims is not anticipated by Figure 7 for at least this reason. Since claims 12 and 18 depend from claim 1, since claims 13 and 19 depend from claim 2, since claims 14 and 20 depend from claim 3, since claims 7, 15 and 21 depend from claim 4, since claims 8, 16, and 22 depend from

claim 5 and since claims 9, 17 and 23 depend from claim 6, these claims are similarly not anticipated by Figure 7 for at least this reason.

### **New claims**


Each of new claims 24 and 25 depends from claim 1 and clarify the periodic repetition of connections from the gate electrodes to the connection terminals within successive pixel rows.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the applicants request that the Examiner pass this application to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

November 1, 2004

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John C. Pokotylo, Attorney  
Reg. No. 36,242  
Tel.: (732) 542-9070

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING under 37 C.F.R. 1.8(a)**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited on **November 1, 2004** with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, with sufficient postage, in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

  
John C. Pokotylo

36,242  
Reg. No.